



REMARKS

Allowable subject matter

Applicant acknowledges the indication of allowability for claims 3 and 4. However, for reasons set forth below, Applicant believes that the remaining claims are also patentable over the cited art.

Applicant submits new claims 9 and 10 that correspond to the subject matter of claims 3 and 4 prior but without the amendments made to claim 1. These claims are therefore allowable.

Section 102 rejection based on *Sellers*

As best understood, the Examiner considers the foot straps **42** shown in FIG. 5 of *Sellers* to correspond to the claimed first and second strap anchors.

In response, Applicant amends the claim to recite the strap anchors disposed at longitudinal positions selected to be adjacent to a rider's thighs. This location allows a strap extending between the strap anchors to engage the thigh. The additional center anchor enables the strap to independently exert forces against the left and right thigh. This in turn allows greater control over the sled.

Sellers discloses strap anchors disposed to extend a strap across the rider's *feet*. This is different from the claimed invention. Moreover, there is no suggestion in *Sellers* to provide a similar configuration of strap anchors at a location along the rider's thighs.

Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 102 rejection based on *Sellers*. Claims 2-8 include the limitations of claim 1 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reason.

Section 102 rejection based on *Kilk*

As best understood, the Examiner considers the slots **39, 40** disposed adjacent to a rider's waist to correspond to the claimed first and second strap anchors. The Examiner presumably considers the slot **38** adjacent to the rider's crotch to then be the claimed center anchor.

FIG. 4 of *Kilk* shows that the slots 39, 40 are not "disposed at a longitudinal position selected to be adjacent to a location along a rider's thighs" as required by amended claim 1. In fact, the slots 39, 40 are not even adjacent to the rider's leg; they are adjacent to the waist.

Moreover, slot 38, which would correspond to the claimed center anchor, is not "between the first and second strap anchors" as recited in the claim.

Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 102 rejection based on *Sellers*. Claims 2-8 include the limitations of claim 1 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reason.

Section 103 rejection of claim 7

As amended, claim 1 recited strap anchors disposed at longitudinal position selected to be adjacent to a rider's thighs. This is different from *Sellers*. *O'Haire* does nothing to remedy this deficiency in the teaching of *Sellers*. Hence, the proposed combination fails to yield the claimed invention.

Summary

Now pending in this application are claims 1-10, of which claims 1, 9, and 10 are independent.

Enclosed is payment for a three-month extension. No additional fees are believed to be due in connection with this response. However, to the extent fees are due, or if a refund is forthcoming, please adjust our deposit account 06-1050 referencing attorney docket 04764-011001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/4/2006



Faustino A. Lichauco
Reg. No. 41,942